arXiv:1107.5852v2 [q-fin.PM] 7 May 2012

Necessary and sufficient conditions in the problem of optimal investment with intermediate consumption

Oleksii Mostovyi
Carnegie Mellon University,
Department of Mathematical Sciences,
5000 Forbes Avenue, Pittsburgh, PA, 15213-3890, US
(omostovy@andrew.cmu.edu)

Abstract

In this paper we consider a problem of optimal investment with intermediate consumption in the framework of an incomplete semimartingale model of a financial market. We show that a necessary and sufficient condition for the validity of key assertions of the theory is that the value functions of the primal and dual problems are finite.

1 Introduction

A fundamental problem of mathematical finance is that of an investor who wants to invest and consume in a way that maximizes his expected utility. The first results for continuous time models were obtained by Merton [18, 19] in a Markovian setting via the dynamic programming arguments. An alternative martingale approach was developed among others by Cox and Huang [3, 4], Karatzas, Lehoczky and Shreve [13], and Karatzas and Shreve [11] for complete markets and by Karatzas, Lehoczky, Shreve and Xu [14], He and Pearson [7, 8], Kramkov and Schachermayer [16, 17], Karatzas and Žitković [12], and Žitković [23] in an incomplete case. The main focus here was to establish conditions under which “key” results, such as the existence of primal and dual optimizers, hold.

When the consumption occurs only at maturity and the utility function is deterministic a necessary and sufficient condition has been obtained in Kramkov and Schachermayer [17]. It is stated as the finiteness of the dual value function. In the case of intermediate consumption and stochastic field utility the latest sufficient conditions are due to Karatzas and Žitković [12] and Žitković [23]. They are formulated in the form of several regularity assumptions such as a uniform asymptotic elasticity.

This paper obtains necessary and sufficient conditions in the general framework of incomplete financial model with stochastic field utility and intermediate consumption occurring according to some stochastic clock. As in [17] we assume that the dual value function is finite (from above). Maybe surprisingly the only other condition we need is the finiteness of the primal value function (from below). Note that the latter condition holds trivially in the setting of [17].

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we describe the model and state the main results. Their proofs are given in Section 4 and are based on an abstract version of the main theorem presented in Section 3.

2 Main Results

A model of a security market consists of $(d+1)$ assets: one bond and d stocks. We assume that the bond is chosen as a numéraire and denote by $S = (S^i)_{1\leq i\leq d}$ the discounted price process of the stocks. We suppose that S is a semimartingale on a complete stochastic basis $(\Omega, \mathscr{F}, (\mathscr{F}_t)_{t\in[0,\infty)}, \mathbb{P})$ with an infinite time horizon.

Define a portfolio Π as a triple (x, H, C), where the constant x is an initial value, $H = (H^i)_{1\leq i\leq d}$ is a predictable S-integrable process of stocks' quantities, and $C = (C_t)_{t\geq 0}$ is an increasing, adapted, and right-continuous process of cumulative consumption. The value process $V = (V_t)_{t\geq 0}$ of such a portfolio Π is defined as

$$V_t \triangleq x + \int_0^t H_u dS_u - C_t, \quad t \geq 0. \tag{2.1}$$

A portfolio Π with $C \equiv 0$ is called *self-financing*. The collection of nonnegative value processes of self-financing portfolios with initial value 1 is denoted by $\mathscr{X}$, i.e.

$$\mathscr{X} \triangleq \left\{ X \geq 0 : \ X_t = 1 + \int_0^t H_u dS_u, \quad t \geq 0 \right\}.$$

A pair (H, C), such that for a given $x > 0$ the corresponding value process V is nonnegative, is called an *x-admissible strategy.* If for a consumption process C we can find a predictable S-integrable process H such that (H, C) is an x-admissible strategy we say that C is an *x-admissible consumption process.*

Hereafter we fix a *stochastic clock* $\kappa = (\kappa_t)_{t \geq 0}$, which is a non-decreasing, cádlág, adapted process such that

$$\kappa_0 = 0, \quad \mathbb{P}\left[\kappa_\infty > 0\right] > 0, \text{ and } \kappa_\infty \leq A \tag{2.2}$$

for some finite constant A. Stochastic clock represents the notion of time according to which consumption occurs. The set of optional densities of the x-admissible consumption processes corresponding to κ is denoted by $\mathscr{A}(x)$, that is,

$$\mathscr{A}(x) \triangleq \left\{ c : C_t = \int_0^t c_u d\kappa_u \text{ is } x\text{-admissible} \right\}, \quad x > 0. \tag{2.3}$$

We write $\mathscr{A} \triangleq \mathscr{A}(1)$ for brevity.

For $t \geq 0$ we denote by $\mathbb{Q}_t$ the restriction of a probability measure $\mathbb{Q}$ to $\mathscr{F}_t$. A probability measure $\mathbb{Q}$ is called a *locally equivalent martingale measure* if for any $t > 0$ we have $\mathbb{Q}_t \sim \mathbb{P}_t$ and any $X \in \mathscr{X}$ is a local martingale under $\mathbb{Q}$. We denote the family of locally equivalent martingale measures by $\mathscr{M}$ and assume that

$$\mathscr{M} \neq \emptyset. \tag{2.4}$$

This condition is closely related to the absence of arbitrage opportunities in the sense of [10]. The corresponding set of cádlág densities is denoted by $\mathscr{Z}$:

$$\mathscr{Z} \triangleq \left\{ Z = \left(\frac{d\mathbb{Q}_t}{d\mathbb{P}_t} \right)_{t \geq 0}, \quad \mathbb{Q} \in \mathscr{M} \right\}. \tag{2.5}$$

We now introduce an economic agent whose consumption preferences are modeled with a *utility stochastic field* $U = U(t, \omega, x) : [0, \infty) \times \Omega \times [0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ satisfying the conditions below.

Assumption 2.1. For every $(t, \omega) \in [0, \infty) \times \Omega$ the function $x \to U(t, \omega, x)$ is strictly concave, increasing, continuously differentiable on $(0, \infty)$ and satisfies the Inada's conditions:

$$\lim_{x \downarrow 0} U'(t, \omega, x) = +\infty \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{x \to \infty} U'(t, \omega, x) \triangleq 0, \tag{2.6}$$

where U' denotes the partial derivative with respect to the third argument, $U(t, \omega, 0) = \lim_{x \downarrow 0} U(t, \omega, x)$, and for every $x \geq 0$ the stochastic process $U(\cdot, \cdot, x)$ is optional.

For a given initial capital $x > 0$ the goal of the agent is to maximize his expected utility. The value function of this problem is denoted by

$$u(x) \triangleq \sup_{c \in \mathscr{A}(x)} \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^\infty U(t, \omega, c_t) d\kappa_t\right], \quad x > 0. \tag{2.7}$$

We use the convention

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^\infty U(t, \omega, c_t) d\kappa_t\right] \triangleq -\infty \quad \text{if} \quad \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^\infty U^-(t, \omega, c_t) d\kappa_t\right] = +\infty.$$

Here and below W^- and W^+ denote the negative and the positive parts of a stochastic field W, respectively.

Our goal is to find conditions on the financial market and the utility field U under which the key conclusions of the utility maximization theory hold, namely, u satisfies the Inada's conditions and the solution $\hat{c}(x) \in \mathscr{A}(x)$ to (2.7) exists.

Remark 2.2. For simplicity of notations we assume in (2.7) that consumption is measured in the units of the bank account. This does not restrict any generality. Indeed, the case when $U = U(t, \omega, x)$ corresponds to the consumption defined in the units of a positive asset $B = (B_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is reduced to the one above if we choose the utility field as $\tilde{U}(t, \omega, x) = U\left(t, \omega, x / B_t(\omega)\right)$.

To study (2.7) we employ standard duality arguments as in [16] and [23] and define the *conjugate stochastic field* V to U as

$$V(t, \omega, y) \triangleq \sup_{x > 0} \left(U(t, \omega, x) - xy\right), \quad (t, \omega, y) \in [0, \infty) \times \Omega \times [0, \infty). \tag{2.8}$$

It is well-known that $-V$ satisfies Assumption 2.1. We also denote

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{Y}(y) \triangleq \mathrm{cl}\,\{&Y : Y \text{ is càdlàg adapted and} \\ &0 \leq Y \leq yZ \ (d\kappa \times \mathbb{P}) \text{ a.e. for some } Z \in \mathscr{Z}\}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

where the closure is taken in the topology of convergence in measure ($d\kappa \times \mathbb{P}$) on the space of real-valued optional processes. We write $\mathscr{Y} \triangleq \mathscr{Y}(1)$ for brevity.

After these preparations we define the value function of the dual optimization problem as

$$v(y) \triangleq \inf_{Y \in \mathscr{Y}(y)} \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^\infty V(t,\omega,Y_t)d\kappa_t\right], \quad y > 0, \tag{2.10}$$

where we use the convention:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^\infty V(t,\omega,Y_t)d\kappa_t\right] \triangleq +\infty \quad \text{if} \quad \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^\infty V^+(t,\omega,Y_t)d\kappa_t\right] = +\infty.$$

The following theorems constitute our main results.

Theorem 2.3. *Assume that conditions* (2.2) *and (2.4) and Assumption 2.1 hold true and*

$$v(y) < \infty \quad \textit{for all } y > 0 \quad \textit{and} \quad u(x) > -\infty \quad \textit{for all } x > 0. \tag{2.11}$$

Then:

1. $u(x) < \infty$ *for all* $x > 0$, $v(y) > -\infty$ *for all* $y > 0$. *The functions* u *and* v *are conjugate,*

$$\begin{aligned} v(y) &= \sup_{x>0}\left(u(x) - xy\right), \quad y > 0, \\ u(x) &= \inf_{y>0}\left(v(y) + xy\right), \quad x > 0. \end{aligned} \tag{2.12}$$

   The functions u, $-v$ *are continuously differentiable on* $(0,\infty)$, *strictly increasing, strictly concave and satisfy Inada's conditions:*

$$\begin{aligned} u'(0) &\triangleq \lim_{x\downarrow 0} u'(x) = +\infty, & -v'(0) &\triangleq \lim_{y\downarrow 0} -v'(y) = +\infty, \\ u'(\infty) &\triangleq \lim_{x\to\infty} u'(x) = 0, & -v'(\infty) &\triangleq \lim_{y\to\infty} -v'(y) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

2. *For any* $x > 0$ *and* $y > 0$ *the optimal solutions* $\hat{c}(x)$ *to (2.7) and* $\hat{Y}(y)$ *to (2.10) exist and are unique. Moreover, if* $y = u'(x)$ *we have the dual relations*

$$\hat{Y}_t(y) = U'\left(t,\omega,\hat{c}_t(x)\right), \quad t \geq 0,$$

   and

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^\infty \hat{c}_t(x)\hat{Y}_t(y)d\kappa_t\right] = xy.$$

The boundendess conditions (2.11) are clearly necessary for the conclusions of either item 1 or 2. Notice that the condition $u(x) > -\infty$ for all $x > 0$ holds trivially if the utility stochastic field U is uniformly bounded from below by a real-valued function. A natural question is whether one can use the set $\mathscr{Z}$ instead of $\mathscr{Y}$ as the dual domain and still obtain the same value function v. In the settings of Kramkov and Schachermayer [16, 17] the answer is positive, however the minimizer might lie outside of the set $\mathscr{Z}$ in general. Theorem 2.4 below states that the same assertion holds in our settings. Furthermore, due to a certain *symmetry* between primal and dual problems (that is explored in more detail in section 3) a similar conclusion holds for the value function u. Thus, as an alternative primal domain one can take any set $\tilde{\mathscr{A}}$ with the following properties:

(i) $\tilde{\mathscr{A}}$ is a convex subset of $\mathscr{A}$ such that

$$\sup_{c\in\tilde{\mathscr{A}}}\int_\Omega c_tY_td\kappa_t = \sup_{c\in\mathscr{A}}\int_\Omega c_tY_td\kappa_t \quad \text{for every } Y\in\mathscr{Y}.$$

(ii) The set $\tilde{\mathscr{A}}$ is closed under the countable convex combinations, that is, for any sequence $(c^n)_{n\geq 1}$ of optional processes in $\tilde{\mathscr{A}}$ and a sequence of positive numbers $(a^n)_{n\geq 1}$ such that $\sum_{n=1}^\infty a^n = 1$, the process $\sum_{n=1}^\infty a^nc^n$ belongs to $\tilde{\mathscr{A}}$.

Theorem 2.4. *Under the conditions of Theorem 2.3, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} v(y) &= \inf_{Z\in\mathscr{Z}}\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^\infty V\left(t,\omega,yZ_t\right)d\kappa_t\right], \quad y>0,\\ u(x) &= \sup_{c\in\tilde{\mathscr{A}}}\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^\infty U(t,\omega,xc_t)d\kappa_t\right], \quad x>0.\end{aligned}$$

The proofs will be given in Section 4 and will rely on Theorems 3.2 and 3.3, which are the "abstract" versions of Theorems 2.3 and 2.4 respectively. We conclude this section with examples of the investment problems (see e.g. Karatzas [9] as well as Karatzas and Shreve [11]) that are included in our formulation. Hereafter, 1_E denotes the indicator function of a set E.

Example 2.5. Maximization of the expected utility from consumption:

$$u(x) = \sup_{c\in\mathscr{A}(x)}\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^T U(t,\omega,c_t)dt\right].$$

Here the clock κ is given by

$$\kappa(t) \triangleq \min(t,\ T), \quad t \geq 0.$$

Example 2.6. Maximization of the expected utility from consumption and terminal wealth:

$$u(x) = \sup_{c \in \mathscr{A}(x)} \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^T U_1(t,\omega,c_t)dt + U_2(\omega,c_T)\right]. \tag{2.13}$$

Here the clock κ is given by

$$\kappa(t) \triangleq t1_{[0,T)}(t) + (T+1)1_{[T,\infty)}(t), \quad t \geq 0.$$

Example 2.7. Maximization of the expected utility from terminal wealth:

$$u(x) = \sup_{X \in \mathscr{X}} \mathbb{E}\left[U(\omega, xX_T)\right], \tag{2.14}$$

The corresponding clock process is

$$\kappa(t) \triangleq 1_{[T,\infty)}(t), \quad t \geq 0.$$

Note that the formulation (2.14) extends the framework of Kramkov and Schachermayer (see [16, 17]) to stochastic utility.

Example 2.8. Maximization of the expected utility from consumption over the infinite time horizon, that is

$$u(x) = \sup_{c \in \mathscr{A}(x)} \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^\infty e^{-\nu t} U(t,\omega,c_t)dt\right], \quad x > 0,\ \nu > 0. \tag{2.15}$$

where the clock is defined as

$$\kappa(t) \triangleq \int_0^t e^{-\nu s}ds = \frac{1}{\nu}\left(1 - e^{-\nu t}\right), \quad t \geq 0.$$

Example 2.9. Maximization of expected utility from consumption occurring at discrete times $(t_1, \ldots, t_N)$:

$$u(x) = \sup_{c \in \mathscr{A}(x)} \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{j=1}^N U(t_j,\omega,c_{t_j})\right], \quad x > 0. \tag{2.16}$$

Here the clock process is

$$\kappa(t) \triangleq \sum_{j=1}^N 1_{[t_j,+\infty)}(t), \quad t \geq 0.$$

3 Abstract versions of the main theorems

Let μ be a finite positive measure on a measurable space $(\Omega, \mathscr{F})$. Denote by $\mathbf{L}^0 = \mathbf{L}^0(\Omega, \mathscr{F}, \mu)$ the vector space of (equivalence classes of) real-valued measurable functions on $(\Omega, \mathscr{F}, \mu)$ topologized by convergence in measure μ. Let $\mathbf{L}^0_+$ denote its positive orthant, i.e.

$$\mathbf{L}^0_+ = \left\{\xi \in \mathbf{L}^0(\Omega, \mathscr{F}, \mu) : \ \xi \geq 0\right\}.$$

For any ξ and η in $\mathbf{L}^0$ we write

$$\langle \xi, \eta \rangle \triangleq \int_\Omega \xi \eta d\mu,$$

whenever the latter integral is well-defined. Let $\mathscr{C}, \mathscr{D}$ be subsets of $\mathbf{L}^0_+$ that satisfy the conditions below.

1. We have

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \xi \in \mathscr{C} & \Leftrightarrow & \langle \xi, \eta \rangle \leq 1 \text{ for all } \eta \in \mathscr{D}, \\ \eta \in \mathscr{D} & \Leftrightarrow & \langle \xi, \eta \rangle \leq 1 \text{ for all } \xi \in \mathscr{C}. \end{array} \tag{3.1}$$

2. $\mathscr{C}$ and $\mathscr{D}$ contain at least one strictly positive element:

$$\text{there are } \ \xi \in \mathscr{C}, \ \eta \in \mathscr{D} \ \text{ such that } \ \min(\xi, \ \eta) > 0. \tag{3.2}$$

Observe that our construction of the abstract sets $\mathscr{C}$ and $\mathscr{D}$ is similar to the one in [16], however we do not require a constant to be an element of $\mathscr{C}$. This allows to introduce the *symmetry* between the sets $\mathscr{C}$ and $\mathscr{D}$ that plays an important role in the proofs. Also notice that $\mathscr{C}$ and $\mathscr{D}$ are bounded in $\mathbf{L}^0(\mu)$. For $x > 0$ and $y > 0$ we define the sets:

$$\begin{array}{rcccl} \mathscr{C}(x) & \triangleq & x\mathscr{C} & \triangleq & \{x\xi : \ \xi \in \mathscr{C}\}, \\ \mathscr{D}(y) & \triangleq & y\mathscr{D} & \triangleq & \{y\eta : \ \eta \in \mathscr{D}\}. \end{array} \tag{3.3}$$

Consider a *stochastic utility function* U: $\Omega \times [0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$, which satisfies the following conditions.

Assumption 3.1. For every $\omega \in \Omega$ the function $x \to U(\omega, x)$ is strictly concave, increasing, continuously differentiable on $(0, \infty)$ and satisfies the Inada's conditions:

$$\lim_{x \downarrow 0} U'(\omega, x) = +\infty \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{x \to \infty} U'(\omega, x) = 0, \tag{3.4}$$

where $U'(\cdot,\cdot)$ denotes the partial derivative with respect to the second argument, $U(\omega,0)=\lim_{x\downarrow 0} U(\omega,x)$, and for every $x\geq 0$ the function $U(\cdot,x)$ is measurable.

Define the *conjugate function* V to U as

$$V(\omega,y)\triangleq \sup_{x>0}\left(U(\omega,x)-xy\right), \quad (\omega,y)\in\Omega\times[0,\infty).$$

For a function W on $\Omega\times[0,\infty)$ and a function $\xi\in\mathbf{L}^0_+$ we will write $W(\xi)\triangleq W(\omega,\xi(\omega))$. Recall that W^+ and W^- denote the positive and the negative parts of W respectively.

Now we can state the optimization problems:

$$u(x)=\sup_{\xi\in\mathscr{C}(x)}\int_\Omega U(\xi)d\mu, \quad x>0, \tag{3.5}$$

$$v(y)=\inf_{\eta\in\mathscr{D}(y)}\int_\Omega V(\eta)d\mu, \quad y>0, \tag{3.6}$$

where we used the convention:

$$\begin{array}{lll} \int_\Omega U(\xi)d\mu\triangleq-\infty & \text{if} & \int_\Omega U^-(\xi)d\mu=+\infty, \\ \int_\Omega V(\eta)d\mu\triangleq+\infty & \text{if} & \int_\Omega V^+(\eta)d\mu=+\infty. \end{array}$$

The following theorem is an abstract version of Theorem 2.3.

Theorem 3.2. *Assume that $\mathscr{C}$ and $\mathscr{D}$ satisfy conditions (3.1) and (3.2). Let Assumption 3.1 holds and suppose*

$$v(y)<\infty \quad \textit{for all } y>0 \quad \textit{and} \quad u(x)>-\infty \quad \textit{for all } x>0. \tag{3.7}$$

Then:

1. *$u(x)<\infty$ for all $x>0$, $v(y)>-\infty$ for all $y>0$. The functions u and v satisfy the biconjugacy relations,*

$$\begin{array}{rcl} v(y) & = & \sup_{x>0}\left(u(x)-xy\right), \quad y>0, \\ u(x) & = & \inf_{y>0}\left(v(y)+xy\right), \quad x>0. \end{array} \tag{3.8}$$

The functions u, $-v$ are continuously differentiable on $(0,\infty)$, increasing, strictly concave and satisfy Inada's conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} u'(0) &\triangleq \lim_{x\downarrow 0} u'(x) = +\infty, & -v'(0) &\triangleq \lim_{y\downarrow 0} -v'(y) = +\infty, \\ u'(\infty) &\triangleq \lim_{x\to\infty} u'(x) = 0, & -v'(\infty) &\triangleq \lim_{y\to\infty} -v'(y) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

2. *For any $x > 0$ the optimal solution $\hat{\xi}(x)$ to (3.5) exists and is unique. For any $y > 0$ the optimal solution $\hat{\eta}(y)$ to (3.6) exists and is unique. If $y = u'(x)$, we have the dual relations*

$$\hat{\eta}(y) = U'\left(\hat{\xi}(x)\right) \quad \mu \text{ a.e.}$$

and

$$\langle \hat{\xi}(x), \hat{\eta}(y) \rangle = xy.$$

In order to state an abstract version of Theorem 2.4 we need the following definitions. Let $\tilde{\mathscr{D}}$ be a convex subset of $\mathscr{D}$ such that

(i) $\tilde{\mathscr{D}}$ is closed under the countable convex combinations,

(ii) for every $\xi \in \mathscr{C}$ we have

$$\sup_{\eta\in\mathscr{D}} \langle \xi, \eta \rangle = \sup_{\eta\in\tilde{\mathscr{D}}} \langle \xi, \eta \rangle. \tag{3.9}$$

Likewise, define $\tilde{\mathscr{C}}$ to be a convex subset of $\mathscr{C}$ such that

(iii) $\tilde{\mathscr{C}}$ is closed under the countable convex combinations,

(iv) for every $\eta \in \mathscr{D}$ we have

$$\sup_{\xi\in\mathscr{C}} \langle \xi, \eta \rangle = \sup_{\xi\in\tilde{\mathscr{C}}} \langle \xi, \eta \rangle.$$

Theorem 3.3. *Under the conditions of Theorem 3.2, we have*

$$v(y) = \inf_{\eta\in\tilde{\mathscr{D}}} \int_\Omega V(y\eta)\, d\mu, \quad y > 0. \tag{3.10}$$

$$u(x) = \sup_{\xi\in\tilde{\mathscr{C}}} \int_\Omega U(x\xi)\, d\mu, \quad x > 0.$$

The proofs of Theorem 3.2 and 3.3 are given via several lemmas.

Lemma 3.4. *Under the conditions of Theorem 3.2, we have*

$$v(y) \geq \sup_{x>0} \left(u(x) - xy \right), \qquad y > 0. \tag{3.11}$$

As a result, both u *and* v *are real-valued functions, such that*

$$\limsup_{x\to\infty} \frac{u(x)}{x} \leq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \liminf_{y\to\infty} \frac{v(y)}{y} \geq 0.$$

Proof. Fix $x > 0$ and $y > 0$. We have

$$\sup_{\xi\in\mathscr{C}(x)} \inf_{\eta\in\mathscr{D}(y)} \int_\Omega \left(U(\xi) - \xi\eta \right) d\mu \leq \inf_{\eta\in\mathscr{D}(y)} \sup_{\xi\in\mathscr{C}(x)} \int_\Omega \left(U(\xi) - \xi\eta \right) d\mu. \tag{3.12}$$

Using (3.1) we can bound the left-hand side from below by $u(x) - xy$:

$$\sup_{\xi\in\mathscr{C}(x)} \inf_{\eta\in\mathscr{D}(y)} \int_\Omega \left(U(\xi) - \xi\eta \right) d\mu \geq \sup_{\xi\in\mathscr{C}(x)} \left(\int_\Omega U(\xi) d\mu - xy \right) = u(x) - xy.$$

Since $V(\eta) \geq U(\xi) - \xi\eta$ for any $\xi > 0$ and $\eta > 0$, we can bound the right-hand side of (3.12) from above by $v(y)$:

$$\inf_{\eta\in\mathscr{D}(y)} \sup_{\xi\in\mathscr{C}(x)} \int_\Omega \left(U(\xi) - \xi\eta \right) d\mu \leq \inf_{\eta\in\mathscr{D}(y)} \int_\Omega V(\eta) d\mu = v(y).$$

□

The techniques from Kramkov and Schachermayer [17] inspired the proof of the following lemma.

Lemma 3.5. *Under the conditions of Theorem 3.2, for any* $y > 0$ *the family* $\left(V^-(h)\right)_{h\in\mathscr{D}(y)}$ *is uniformly integrable.*

Proof. Fix $y > 0$. Assume by contradiction that $\left(V^-(h)\right)_{h\in\mathscr{D}(y)}$ is not a uniformly integrable family. Then we can find a sequence $\left(\eta^n\right)_{n\geq 2} \subset \mathscr{D}(y)$, a sequence $\left(A^n\right)_{n\geq 2}$ of disjoint subsets of $(\Omega, \mathscr{F})$ and a constant $\alpha > 0$ such that

$$\int_\Omega V^-\left(\eta^n\right) 1_{A^n} d\mu \geq \alpha, \quad n \geq 2.$$

Since $v(y) < \infty$, there exists $\eta^1 \in \mathscr{D}(y)$ such that

$$M \triangleq \int_\Omega V^+\left(\eta^1\right) d\mu < \infty.$$

Define a sequence $\left(\zeta^n\right)_{n\geq 1}$ as $\zeta^n \triangleq \sum\limits_{k=1}^{n} \eta^k$, $n \geq 1$. Then by (3.1) for any $\xi \in \mathscr{C}$ we have

$$\langle \zeta^n, \xi \rangle = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \langle \eta^k, \xi \rangle \leq ny.$$

Thus $\zeta^n \in \mathscr{D}(ny)$, $n \geq 1$. Now, since V^- is nonnegative and nondecreasing we get

$$\begin{aligned} \textstyle\int_\Omega V^-\left(\zeta^n\right) d\mu &\geq \textstyle\int_\Omega \sum\limits_{k=2}^{n} V^-\left(\sum\limits_{j=1}^{n} \eta^j\right) 1_{A^k} d\mu \\ &\geq \textstyle\int_\Omega \sum\limits_{k=2}^{n} V^-\left(\eta^k\right) 1_{A^k} d\mu \\ &\geq \alpha(n-1), \quad n \geq 2. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand since V^+ is nonincreasing we obtain

$$\int_\Omega V^+\left(\zeta^n\right) d\mu \leq \int_\Omega V^+\left(\eta^1\right) d\mu = M < \infty.$$

Therefore we can deduce that

$$\int_\Omega V\left(\zeta^n\right) d\mu \leq M - \alpha(n-1), \quad n \geq 2.$$

Consequently,

$$\liminf_{z\to\infty} \frac{v(z)}{z} \leq \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{\int_\Omega V\left(\zeta^n\right) d\mu}{ny} \leq \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{M - \alpha(n-1)}{ny} = -\frac{\alpha}{y} < 0,$$

which contradicts to the conclusion of Lemma 3.4. □

We need a version of Komlós' lemma for the set $\mathscr{D}$. Some other formulations of Komlós' lemma are proved in [15, 5, 1, 21].

Lemma 3.6. *Assume that the sets $\mathscr{C}$ and $\mathscr{D}$ satisfy (3.1) and (3.2). Let $\left(\eta^n\right)_{n\geq 1} \subset \mathscr{D}$. Then there exists a sequence of convex combinations $\zeta^n \in$ conv $\left(\eta^n, \eta^{n+1}, \dots\right)$, $n \geq 1$, and an element $\hat{\eta} \in \mathscr{D}$, such that $\left(\zeta^n\right)_{n\geq 1}$ converges μ a.e. to $\hat{\eta}$.*

Proof. Using Lemma A1.1 p.515 in [5] we can construct a sequence $\zeta^n \in \operatorname{conv}(\eta^n, \eta^{n+1}, \dots)$, $n \geq 1$, such that $(\zeta^n)_{n\geq 1}$ converges μ a.e. to an element $\hat{\eta}$. By convexity of the set $\mathscr{D}$ we obtain that $(\zeta^n)_{n\geq 1}$ is a subset of $\mathscr{D}$. By Fatou's lemma $\hat{\eta} \in \mathscr{D}$, since for any $\xi \in \mathscr{C}$ we have

$$\langle \xi, \hat{\eta} \rangle \leq \liminf_{n\to\infty} \langle \xi, \zeta^n \rangle \leq 1.$$

□

Lemma 3.7. *Under conditions of Theorem 3.2 for each $y > 0$ there exists a unique $\hat{\eta}(y) \in \mathscr{D}(y)$, such that*

$$v(y) = \int_\Omega V\left(\hat{\eta}(y)\right) d\mu. \tag{3.13}$$

As a consequence v is strictly convex.

Proof. Fix $y > 0$. Let $(\eta^n)_{n=1}^\infty \subset \mathscr{D}(y)$ be a minimizing sequence, i.e.,

$$v(y) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \int_\Omega V\left(\eta^n\right) d\mu.$$

It follows from Lemma 3.6 that there exists a sequence of convex combinations $\zeta^n \in \operatorname{conv}(\eta^n, \eta^{n+1}, \dots)$, $n \geq 1$, and an element $\hat{\eta}(y) \in \mathscr{D}(y)$, such that $(\zeta^n)_{n=1}^\infty$ converges μ a.e. to $\hat{\eta}(y)$.

Using convexity of V, Lemma 3.5, and Fatou's lemma we get

$$v(y) = \liminf_{n\to\infty} \int_\Omega V\left(\eta^n\right) d\mu \geq \liminf_{n\to\infty} \int_\Omega V\left(\zeta^n\right) d\mu \geq \int_\Omega V\left(\hat{\eta}(y)\right) d\mu.$$

Therefore (3.13) holds. Uniqueness of the minimizer to (3.6) follows from strict convexity of V.

To show strict convexity of v, fix $y_1 < y_2$. Since $\frac{\hat{\eta}(y_1)+\hat{\eta}(y_2)}{2} \in \mathscr{D}\left(\frac{y_1+y_2}{2}\right)$ and V is strictly convex we obtain

$$v\left(\frac{y_1+y_2}{2}\right) \leq \int_\Omega V\left(\frac{\hat{\eta}(y_1)+\hat{\eta}(y_2)}{2}\right) d\mu < \frac{v(y_1)+v(y_2)}{2}.$$

□

By the symmetry between the sets $\mathscr{C}$ and $\mathscr{D}$ as well as problems (3.5) and (3.6), proof of the following result is entirely similar to the proof of Lemma 3.7.

Lemma 3.8. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 3.2, for any $x > 0$ there exists a unique maximizer to the primal problem (3.5). As a consequence u is strictly concave.*

The techniques in Kramkov and Schachermayer [16] helped to prove the following lemma.

Lemma 3.9. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 3.2, we have*

$$v(y) = \sup_{x>0} \left(u(x) - xy \right), \quad y > 0.$$

Proof. Let $\hat{\xi} \triangleq \underset{\xi \in \mathscr{C}(1/2)}{\arg\min} \int_\Omega U(\xi) d\mu$ and ξ_0 be a strictly positive element of $\mathscr{C}$. Both $\hat{\xi}$ and ξ_0 exist by Lemma 3.8 and assumption (3.2) respectively. Define

$$\tilde{\xi} \triangleq \max(2\hat{\xi}, \xi_0).$$

Then $\tilde{\xi} \in \mathscr{C}(2)$ and $\int_\Omega U(\tilde{\xi}x) d\mu$ is finite for any $x \geq 1/2$. Let S_n be the set of all nonnegative, measurable functions $\xi : \Omega \to [0, n]$, i.e.

$$S_n \triangleq \left\{ \xi \in \mathbf{L}^0 : \xi(\omega) \in [0, n] \text{ for all } \omega \in \Omega \right\}, \quad n > 0. \tag{3.14}$$

The sets S_n are $\sigma(\mathbf{L}^\infty, \mathbf{L}^1)$ compact. Fix $y > 0$. Since $\mathscr{D}(y)$ is convex and U is concave the minimax theorem (see [22], Theorem 45.8) gives the following equality for every $n \geq 1$

$$\sup_{\xi \in S_n} \inf_{\eta \in \mathscr{D}(y)} \int_\Omega \left(U(\tilde{\xi}\xi) - \tilde{\xi}\xi\eta \right) d\mu = \inf_{\eta \in \mathscr{D}(y)} \sup_{\xi \in S_n} \int_\Omega \left(U(\tilde{\xi}\xi) - \tilde{\xi}\xi\eta \right) d\mu. \tag{3.15}$$

Denote

$$\mathscr{C}'(x) \triangleq \left\{ \xi \in \mathscr{C}(x) : \sup_{\eta \in \mathscr{D}(y)} \langle \xi, \eta \rangle = xy \right\}.$$

It follows from (3.3) that $\bigcup_{x>0} \mathscr{C}'(x) \bigcup \{\xi \equiv 0\} = \bigcup_{x>0} \mathscr{C}(x)$. As a result, using Fatou's lemma we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{x>0} \left(u(x) - xy \right) &= \sup_{x>0} \sup_{\xi \in \mathscr{C}'(x)} \left(\textstyle\int_\Omega U(\xi) d\mu - xy \right) \\ &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_{\xi \in S_n} \inf_{\eta \in \mathscr{D}(y)} \textstyle\int_\Omega \left(U(\tilde{\xi}\xi) - \tilde{\xi}\xi\eta \right) d\mu. \end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

In view of (3.15) and (3.16) it suffices to show that

$$v(y) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \inf_{\eta\in\mathscr{D}(y)} \sup_{\xi\in S_n} \int_\Omega \Big(U(\tilde{\xi}\xi) - \tilde{\xi}\xi\eta \Big)\, d\mu. \tag{3.17}$$

For each $n \geq 1$ define V^n as follows:

$$V^n(z) \triangleq \sup_{0<x\leq n} \Big(U(\tilde{\xi}x) - \tilde{\xi}xz \Big), \quad z > 0.$$

Then via pointwise maximization we get

$$\inf_{\eta\in\mathscr{D}(y)} \sup_{\xi\in S_n} \int_\Omega \Big(U(\tilde{\xi}\xi) - \tilde{\xi}\xi\eta \Big)\, d\mu = \inf_{\eta\in\mathscr{D}(y)} \int_\Omega V^n(\eta) d\mu \triangleq v^n(y).$$

Notice that $v^n \leq v$, $n \geq 1$, and $(v^n(y))_{n\geq 1}$ is increasing. Let $(\eta^n)_{n\geq 1} \subset \mathscr{D}(y)$ be such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} v^n(y) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \int_\Omega V^n(\eta^n) d\mu. \tag{3.18}$$

It follows from Lemma 3.6, that there exists a sequence $\zeta^n \in \mathrm{conv}(\eta^n, \eta^{n+1}, \dots)$, $n \geq 1$, such that $(\zeta^n)_{n\geq 1}$ converges μ a.e. to a function $\hat{\zeta} \in \mathscr{D}(y)$.

We claim that $(V^n)^- (\zeta^n)$, $n \geq 1$, is a uniformly integrable sequence. On $\{\zeta^n \geq U'(\tilde{\xi}n)\}$ we have $(V^n)^- (\zeta^n) = V^-(\zeta^n)$. Consequently uniform integrability of $(V^n)^- (\zeta^n) 1_{\{\zeta^n \geq U'(\tilde{\xi}n)\}}$, $n \geq 1$, follows from Lemma 3.5. Whereas on $\{\zeta^n < U'(\tilde{\xi}n)\}$ we get

$$(V^n)^- (\zeta^n) 1_{\{\zeta^n < U'(\tilde{\xi}n)\}} \leq U^-(\tilde{\xi}) + \tilde{\xi}U'(\tilde{\xi}).$$

From monotonicity of U' we deduce

$$\tilde{\xi}U'(\tilde{\xi}) \leq 2\int_{1/2}^1 \tilde{\xi}U'(\tilde{\xi}x)dx = 2U(\tilde{\xi}) - 2U(\tilde{\xi}/2),$$

where $\Big(U(\tilde{\xi}) - U(\tilde{\xi}/2)\Big)$ is integrable. Consequently $(V^n)^- (\zeta^n) 1_{\{\zeta^n < U'(\tilde{\xi}n)\}}$, $n \geq 1$, is dominated from above by an integrable function. As a result, the sequence $(V^n)^- (\zeta^n)$, $n \geq 1$, is uniformly integrable.

Therefore from monotonicity of $(v^n(y))_{n\geq 1}$, convexity of V^n, $n \geq 1$, and Fatou's lemma we get

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \int_\Omega V^n(\eta^n) d\mu \geq \liminf_{n\to\infty} \int_\Omega V^n(\zeta^n) d\mu = \int_\Omega V(\hat{\zeta}) d\mu \geq v(y),$$

which implies (3.17) by (3.18). □

Proof of Theorem 3.2. Observe that by Lemmas 3.8 and 3.7 both functions u and $-v$ are strictly concave. Thus, conjugacy relations (3.8) follow from Lemma 3.9 and Theorem 12.2 in Rockafellar [20]. In turn strict concavity of u and $-v$, (3.8), and Theorem 26.3 in [20] imply differentiability of u and v everywhere in their domains. Now since u and $-v$ are increasing, Inada's conditions for them follow from Lemma 3.4.

Fix $x > 0$ and take $y = u'(x)$. Let $\hat{\eta} \in \mathscr{D}(y)$ be the optimizer to the dual problem (3.6) and $\hat{\xi} \in \mathscr{C}(x)$ be the optimizer to the primal problem (3.5). Both $\hat{\eta}$ and $\hat{\xi}$ exist by Lemmas 3.7 and 3.8 respectively. Using the definition of V, (3.1), (3.3), and Theorem 23.5 in [20] we get

$$0 \leq \int_\Omega \left(V\left(\hat{\eta}\right) - U\left(\hat{\xi}\right) + \hat{\xi}\hat{\eta} \right) d\mu \leq v(y) - u(x) + xy = 0.$$

Therefore, for μ a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$ we have

$$V\left(\hat{\eta}\right) = U\left(\hat{\xi}\right) - \hat{\xi}\hat{\eta}.$$

This implies the remaining assertions of the theorem:

$$\begin{array}{c} U'\left(\hat{\xi}\right) = \hat{\eta} \quad \mu \text{ a.e.}, \\ \langle \hat{\xi}, \hat{\eta} \rangle = \int_\Omega U\left(\hat{\xi}\right) d\mu - \int_\Omega V\left(\hat{\eta}\right) d\mu = u(x) - v(y) = xy. \end{array}$$

□

In order to prove Theorem 3.3 we proceed in a way that is similar to the proof of Proposition 1 in [17]. The reader that is familiar with this proof might proceed directly to Section 4. We still present the proofs for the sake of completeness. Again, by symmetry it suffices to show that (3.10) holds.

Define the *polar* of a set $A \subseteq \mathbf{L}^0_+$ as

$$A^o \triangleq \left\{ \xi \in \mathbf{L}^0_+ : \ \langle \xi, \eta \rangle \leq 1 \ \text{ for all } \eta \in A \right\},$$

a subset A of $\mathbf{L}^0_+$ is called *solid* if $0 \leq \eta \leq \zeta$ and $\zeta \in A$ implies that $\eta \in A$. Observe that the sets $\mathscr{C}$ and $\mathscr{D}$ satisfy the bipolar relations. We will use a version of the *bipolar theorem* that was proved by Brannath and Schachermayer in [2]: for a subset A of $\mathbf{L}^0_+$ the bipolar A^{oo} is the smallest subset of $\mathbf{L}^0_+$ containing A, which is convex, solid, and closed with respect to the topology of convergence in measure.

Lemma 3.10. *Under the conditions of Theorem 3.2, for any fixed $y > 0$ let $\hat{\eta}(y)$ be the minimizer to the dual problem (3.6). Then there exists a sequence $(\zeta^n)_{n\geq 1}$ in $\tilde{\mathscr{D}}$ that μ a.e. converges to $\hat{\eta}(y)/y$.*

Proof. Fix $y > 0$. Observe that $\tilde{\mathscr{D}}$ is the convex set that satisfies (3.9). Therefore, applying the bipolar theorem (see [2]) we deduce that $\mathscr{D}$ is the smallest convex, closed and solid subset of $\mathbf{L}^0_+(\Omega, \mathscr{F}, \mu)$ containing $\tilde{\mathscr{D}}$. Thus for any $\eta \in \mathscr{D}$ there exists a sequence $(\zeta^n)_{n\geq 1}$ in $\tilde{\mathscr{D}}$ such that $\zeta = \lim\limits_{n\to\infty} \zeta^n$ exists μ a.e. and $\zeta \geq \eta$. In particular such a sequence exists for $\eta = \hat{\eta}(y)/y$. We deduce from optimality of $\hat{\eta}(y)$ that $\eta = \zeta = \lim\limits_{n\to\infty} \zeta^n$. ☐

Lemma 3.11. *Under the conditions of Theorem 3.2 for each $y > 0$ we have*

$$\inf_{\eta\in\tilde{\mathscr{D}}} \int_\Omega V(y\eta)d\mu < \infty.$$

Proof. To simplify notations we will assume that $y = 1$. Let $(a^n)_{n\geq 1}$ be a sequence of strictly positive real numbers such that $\sum\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} a^n = 1$. By Lemma 3.7, for each $n \geq 1$ there exists $\hat{\eta}(a^n)$, the minimizer to the dual problem (3.6). One can construct a sequence of strictly positive numbers $(\delta_n)_{n\geq 2}$, which decreases to 0, such that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_\Omega V\left(\hat{\eta}(a^n)\right) 1_{A_n} d\mu < \infty, \quad \text{if } A_n \in \mathscr{F}, \text{and } \mu(A_n) \leq \delta_n,\ n \geq 2. \tag{3.19}$$

From Lemma 3.10 we deduce the existence of a sequence $(\eta^n)_{n\geq 1} \subset \tilde{\mathscr{D}}$ such that

$$\mu\left(V\left(a^n\eta^n\right) > V\left(\hat{\eta}(a^n)\right) + 1\right) \leq \delta_{n+1},\ \ n \geq 1.$$

Define the sequences of measurable sets $(B_n)_{n\geq 1}$ and $(A_n)_{n\geq 1}$ as follows:

$$B_n \triangleq \left\{V\left(a^n\eta^n\right) \leq V\left(\hat{\eta}(a^n)\right) + 1\right\}, \quad n \geq 1,$$

$$A_1 \triangleq B_1, \ldots, A_n \triangleq B_n \backslash \left(\bigcup_{k=1}^{n-1} A_k\right), \ldots.$$

Then $(A_n)_{n\geq 1}$ is a measurable partition of Ω and $\mu(A_n) \leq \delta_n$ for $n \geq 2$.

To finish the proof, let $\eta \triangleq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a^n \eta^n$. Then $\eta \in \tilde{\mathscr{D}}$, since $\tilde{\mathscr{D}}$ is closed under countable convex combinations. From the construction of $(A_n)_{n\geq 1}$, monotonicity of V, and (3.19) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\Omega V(\eta) d\mu &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_\Omega V\left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a^j \eta^j\right) 1_{A_n} d\mu \\ &\leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_\Omega V\left(a^n \eta^n\right) 1_{A_n} d\mu \\ &\leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_\Omega V\left(\hat{\eta}(a^n)\right) 1_{A_n} d\mu + \mu(\Omega) \\ &< \infty. \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof of the lemma. $\square$

Lemma 3.12. *Under the conditions of Theorem 3.2, we have*

$$v(y) = \inf_{\eta \in \tilde{\mathscr{D}}} \int_\Omega V(y\eta) d\mu, \qquad y > 0.$$

Proof. Fix $y > 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. It suffices to show that there exists $\eta \in \tilde{\mathscr{D}}$ such that

$$\int_\Omega V\left((y+\varepsilon)\eta\right) d\mu \leq v(y) + \varepsilon.$$

Let $\hat{\eta} \in \mathscr{D}(y)$ be the minimizer to the dual problem (3.6), ζ be an element of $\tilde{\mathscr{D}}$, such that

$$\int_\Omega V\left(\varepsilon\zeta\right) d\mu < \infty,$$

whose existence follows from Lemma 3.11. Let $\delta > 0$ be such that

$$\int_\Omega \left(\left|V\left(\hat{\eta}\right)\right| + \left|V\left(\varepsilon\zeta\right)\right|\right) 1_A d\mu \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \text{ if } A \in \mathscr{F} \text{ with } \mu(A) \leq \delta.$$

By Lemma 3.10 there exists $\theta \in \tilde{\mathscr{D}}$ such that the set

$$B \triangleq \left\{ V\left(y\theta\right) > V\left(\hat{\eta}\right) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2\mu(\Omega)} \right\}$$

has measure $\mu(B) \leq \delta$. Define

$$\eta \triangleq \frac{y\theta + \varepsilon\zeta}{y+\varepsilon}.$$

Since $\tilde{\mathscr{D}}$ is convex it follows that $\eta \in \tilde{\mathscr{D}}$. By construction of the set B and monotonicity of V we obtain

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
\int_\Omega V\left((y+\varepsilon)\eta\right) d\mu & = & \int_\Omega V\left(y\theta+\varepsilon\zeta\right) d\mu \\
& \leq & \int_\Omega V\left(y\theta\right) 1_{B^c} d\mu + \int_\Omega V\left(\varepsilon\zeta\right) 1_B d\mu \\
& \leq & \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \int_\Omega V\left(\hat{\eta}\right) d\mu + \int_\Omega \left(V\left(\varepsilon\zeta\right) - V\left(\hat{\eta}\right)\right) 1_B d\mu \\
& \leq & v(y)+\varepsilon.
\end{array}$$

□

4 Proofs of the main theorems

We start from an auxiliary lemma, which gives a useful characterization of the set of admissible consumptions.

Lemma 4.1. *Let c be a nonnegative optional process, κ be a stochastic clock. Under the assumptions (2.2) and (2.4), the following conditions are equivalent:*

(i) $c \in \mathscr{A}$,

(ii) $\sup\limits_{Z\in\mathscr{Z}} \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^\infty c_t Z_t d\kappa_t\right] \leq 1$.

Proof. Using localization an integration by parts we get for each $\mathbb{Q} \in \mathscr{M}$:

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}\left[\int_0^\infty c_t d\kappa_t\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^\infty c_t \frac{d\mathbb{Q}_t}{d\mathbb{P}_t} d\kappa_t\right].$$

Let the probability measure $\mathbb{P}$ be an element of $\mathscr{M}$. Then the conclusion of the lemma follows from Theorem 5.12 in [6]. □

Lemma 4.2. *For any stochastic clock κ, $\mathscr{Z}$ is a subset of $\mathscr{Y}$ that is closed under countable convex combinations. Moreover, for any $c \in \mathscr{A}$ we have*

$$\sup_{Z\in\mathscr{Z}} \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^\infty c_t Z_t d\kappa_t\right] = \sup_{Y\in\mathscr{Y}} \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^\infty c_t Y_t d\kappa_t\right] \leq 1.$$

Proof. Closedness under countable convex combinations of $\mathscr{Z}$ follows from closedness under countable convex combinations of $\mathscr{M}$. By definition (2.9) for an arbitrary $Y \in \mathscr{Y}$ we can find a sequence $\left(Y^n\right)_{n\geq 1}$ in the solid hull of $\mathscr{Z}$

(i.e. such that $Y^n \leq Z^n$ $(d\kappa \times \mathbb{P})$ a.e. for some $Z^n \in \mathscr{Z}$), such that $(Y^n)_{n\geq 1}$ converges $(d\kappa \times \mathbb{P})$ a.e. to Y. Using Fatou's lemma and Lemma 4.1 we get

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^\infty c_t Y_t d\kappa_t\right] \leq \liminf_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^\infty c_t Y_t^n d\kappa_t\right] \leq \sup_{Z\in\mathscr{Z}} \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^\infty c_t Z_t d\kappa_t\right] \leq 1.$$

□

Denote by $\mathbf{L}^0 = \mathbf{L}^0(d\kappa \times \mathbb{P})$ the linear space of (equivalence classes of) real-valued optional processes on the stochastic basis $\left(\Omega, \mathscr{F}, (\mathscr{F}_t)_{t\geq 0}, \mathbb{P}\right)$ which we equip with the topology of convergence in measure $(d\kappa \times \mathbb{P})$. Let $\mathbf{L}^0_+$ be the positive orthant of $\mathbf{L}^0$. Recall that a *polar* of a set $A \subseteq \mathbf{L}^0_+$ is defined as:

$$A^o \triangleq \left\{Y \in \mathbf{L}^0_+ : \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^\infty c_t Y_t d\kappa_t\right] \leq 1 \text{ for all } c \in A\right\}.$$

In order to complete the proof of Theorem 2.3 it suffices to prove the following proposition. Note that the sets $\mathscr{C}$, $\mathscr{D}$ and measure μ in Theorem 3.2 correspond to the sets $\mathscr{A}$, $\mathscr{Y}$ and measure $(d\kappa \times \mathbb{P})$ in Theorem 2.3 respectively. The proof of Theorem 2.4 follows from Theorem 3.3, as the sets $\tilde{\mathscr{C}}$ and $\tilde{\mathscr{D}}$ accord with the sets $\tilde{\mathscr{A}}$ and $\mathscr{Z}$.

Proposition 4.3. *Assume that an $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued semimartingale S satisfies (2.4). Then the sets $\mathscr{A}$ and $\mathscr{Y}$, defined in (2.3) and (2.9) respectively, have the following properties:*

(i) $\mathscr{A}$ and $\mathscr{Y}$ are subsets of $\mathbf{L}^0_+$ that are convex, solid and closed in the topology of convergence in measure $(d\kappa \times \mathbb{P})$.

(ii) The sets $\mathscr{A}$ and $\mathscr{Y}$ satisfy the bipolar relations:

$$\begin{array}{lcl} c \in \mathscr{A} & \Leftrightarrow & \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^\infty c_t Y_t d\kappa_t\right] \leq 1 \quad \text{for all} \quad Y \in \mathscr{Y}, \\ Y \in \mathscr{Y} & \Leftrightarrow & \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^\infty c_t Y_t d\kappa_t\right] \leq 1 \quad \text{for all} \quad c \in \mathscr{A}. \end{array}$$

(iii) There exists $c \in \mathscr{A}$ such that $c > 0$ and there exists $Y \in \mathscr{Y}$ such that $Y > 0$.

Proof. *(i)* It is enough to show closedness of $\mathscr{A}$. Let $(c^n)_{n\geq 1}$ be a sequence in $\mathscr{A}$ that $(d\kappa \times \mathbb{P})$ a.e. converges to c. For an arbitrary $Z \in \mathscr{Z}$ using Fatou's lemma and Lemma 4.1 we get:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^\infty c_t Z_t d\kappa_t\right] \leq \liminf_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^\infty c_t^n Z_t d\kappa_t\right] \leq 1.$$

Therefore by Lemma 4.1 $c \in \mathscr{A}$, and thus $\mathscr{A}$ is closed.

(ii) It follows from Lemma 4.1 that

$$\mathscr{A} = \mathscr{Z}^o,$$

whereas from Lemma 4.2 we deduce

$$\mathscr{Y} \subseteq \mathscr{A}^o = \mathscr{Z}^{oo}. \tag{4.1}$$

Since $\mathscr{Y}$ is closed, convex and solid and $\mathscr{Z} \subset \mathscr{Y}$, it follows from the bipolar theorem of Brannath and Schachermayer that $\mathscr{Z}^{oo} \subseteq \mathscr{Y}$. Combining this with (4.1) we conclude that

$$\mathscr{Y} = \mathscr{A}^o. \tag{4.2}$$

On the other hand it follows from part *(i)* that $\mathscr{A}$ is also convex, closed and solid. Thus $\mathscr{A} = \mathscr{A}^{oo}$ by the bipolar theorem. Therefore, from (4.2) we get

$$\mathscr{A} = \mathscr{Y}^o.$$

(iii) Since $\mathscr{X}$ contains a constant function $\mathbf{1} = (1)_{t \geq 0}$, the existence of $c \in \mathscr{A}$, such that $c > 0$, follows from the definition of the set $\mathscr{A}$. The existence of $Y \in \mathscr{Y}$, such that $Y > 0$, follows from assumption (2.4). This completes the proof of Proposition 4.3. ☐

Acknowledgement. This work is part of the author's PhD Thesis. I would like to thank Dmitry Kramkov for being a supportive adivisor, whose suggestions and ideas helped in writing this paper.

References

[1] M. Beiglböck, W. Schachermayer, and B. Veliyev. A short proof of the Doob-Meyer Theorem. *preprint*, 2010.

[2] W. Brannath and W. Schachermayer. A bipolar theorem for subsets of $L^0_+(\Omega, \mathscr{F}, \mathbb{P})$. *Séminaire de Probabilités XXXIII, Springer Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, XXXIII:349–354, 1999.

[3] J. C. Cox and C. F. Huang. Optimal consumption and portfolio policies when asset prices follow a diffusion process. *J. Econom. Theory*, 49: 33–83, 1989.

[4] J. C. Cox and C. F. Huang. A variational problem arising in financial economics. *J. Math. Econom.*, 20:465–487, 1991.

[5] F. Delbaen and W. Schachermayer. A general version of the fundamental theorem of asset pricing. *Math. Ann.*, 300:463–520, 1994.

[6] F. Delbaen and W. Schachermayer. The fundamental theorem of asset pricing for unbounded stochastic processes. *Math. Ann.*, 312:215–250, 1998.

[7] H. He and N. D. Pearson. Consumption and portfolio policies with incomplete markets and short-sale constraints: the finite-dimensional case. *Math. Finance*, 1:1–10, 1991.

[8] H. He and N. D. Pearson. Consumption and portfolio policies with incomplete markets and short-sale constraints: the infinite-dimensional case. *J. Econom. Theory*, 54:259–304, 1991.

[9] I. Karatzas. Optimization problems in the theory of continuous trading. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 27:1221–1259, 1989.

[10] I. Karatzas and K. Kardaras. The numéraire portfolio in semimartingale financial models. *Finance Stoch.*, 11:447–493, 2007.

[11] I. Karatzas and S. Shreve. *Methods of Mathematical Finance.* Springer, 1998.

[12] I. Karatzas and G. Žitković. Optimal consumption from investment and random endowment in incomplete semi-martingale markets. *Ann. Probab.*, 31:1821–1858, 2003.

[13] I. Karatzas, J.P. Lehoczky, and S.E. Shreve. Optimal portfolio and consumption decisions for a small investor on a finite horizon. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 25:1557–1586, 1987.

[14] I. Karatzas, J. P. Lehoczky, S. E. Shreve, and G. L. Xu. Martingale and duality methods for utility maximization in an incomplete market. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 29:702–730, 1991.

[15] Komlós. A generalization of a problem of Steinhaus. *Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar.*, 18:217–229, 1967.

[16] D. Kramkov and W. Schachermayer. The asymptotic elasticity of utility functions and optimal investment in incomplete markets. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 9:904–950, 1999.

[17] D. Kramkov and W. Schachermayer. Necessary and sufficient conditions in the problem of optimal investment in incomplete markets. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 13:1504–1516, 2003.

[18] R. C. Merton. Lifetime portfolio selection under uncertainty: the continuous-time case. *Rev. Econom. Statist.*, 51:247–257, 1969.

[19] R. C. Merton. Optimum consumption and portfolio rules in a continuous-time model. *J. Econom. Theory*, 3:373–413, 1971.

[20] R. T. Rockafellar. *Convex Analysis.* Princeton Univ. Press., 1970.

[21] Schwartz. New proofs of a theorem by Komlós. *Acta Math. Hungar.*, 47(1-2):181–185, 1986.

[22] H. Strasser. *Mathematical theory of statistics: statistical experiments and asymptotic decision theory.* de Gruyter, Berlin, 1985.

[23] G. Žitković. Utility maximization with a stochastic clock and an unbounded random endowment. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 15:748–777, 2005.